

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated October 22, 2007. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

As outlined above, claims 1-10 stand for consideration in this application, wherein claims 1-10 are being amended.

Additional Amendments

The specification is being amended to correct typographical errors. All amendments to the application are fully supported therein. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Prior Art Rejections

35 U.S.C. §102(a) Rejections

Each of claims 1-10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,194,524). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons set forth below.

According to the M.P.E.P. §2131, a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a), (b), and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Claim 1

Claim 1 as amended recites a search method with a search broker for searching for a service server providing an element service, for selecting and carrying out an element service in a next stage organized in a hierarchical structure from a group of element service servers for providing element services, said search broker being connected to a client for requesting a service, the group of element service servers for providing more than two element services for providing a composite service organized in a hierarchical structure, a policy database for holding policy information about service contents requested by said client, and a registry for

holding contents of the element services provided by said element service servers, said search method comprising: a first step of receiving a request for service; a second step of obtaining policy information of said client from said policy database by inquiring the policy information of said client which requested said service; a third step of obtaining information indicating a service server matching with said service from said registry by requesting a search of the service server matching with a service concerned with said search request; a fourth step of extracting a service server matching with the policy information of said client obtained in said second step among the service servers relating to said information obtained in said third step; and a fifth step of transmitting information indicating the service server extracted in said fourth step to a source of the request for searching a service without handing policy information of said client.

In a method as recited in claim 1, in order to search for a service in a next stage, the client and the server do not search a registry directly, but carry out a search for the service through a search broker. The search broker searches the service in the registry by obtaining policy information of the client from a policy database. The search broker extracts a service server matching with the obtained policy information of the client. Then, the search broker returns a result of the search to the client and/or the server which requests the service. Instead of the client or the portal server, the search broker accesses a policy database to obtain the client's policy information. Therefore, when the element service is requested hierarchically, an element service at the next stage reflecting the client's policy can be selected and carried out without passing the policy information of the client to the server for providing the service.

In contrast, Suzuki shows that an information processing system comprises an information disclosing server for disclosing contents, a portal server for obtaining information regarding contents from the information disclosing server and for integrating/disclosing the information as a portal site, and a client for accessing the portal server to utilize the portal site. The information disclosing server stores additional information indicating the attributes of the contents and the logical structure of the contents. The logical structure of the contents indicates parent-child relationships among the contents. (Abstract, col. 1, lines 53-64) The portal server obtains and stores the additional information from the information disclosing server. The portal server creates a desired page by using the additional information which includes the contents the attributes of the contents and the logical structure of the contents.

In Suzuki, an agent and a database storing page information and the contents information are implemented on the portal server. Agent adapters (AA) are implemented on the information disclosing server. The portal server registers the information disclosing server. The agent registers definition information regarding the agent adapter, and then, the portal server registers an information collection policy for the agent. The agent obtains the additional information XML document stored in the AA on the basis of the information collection policy. In other words, the portal server itself accesses the information disclosing server. Therefore, if a hierarchical level of the information disclosing server is the same as that of the portal server, the policy information will be diffused. In such a case, an element service reflecting the policy is selected and executed without passing the client's policy to a server for providing a service. However, Suzuki does not show or suggest selecting and executing an element service at a next stage reflecting the client's policy without passing the client's policy to a service server for providing an element service.

Therefore, Suzuki does not show every element recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Suzuki.

Claims 3, 9

Claims 3 and 9 have substantially the same features as those of claim 1. As such, the arguments set forth above are equally applicable here. Claim 1 being allowable, claims 3 and 9 must also be allowable.

Claims 2, 4-8, 10

As to dependent claims 2, 4-8, and 10, the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1 are equally applicable here. The corresponding base claim being allowable, claims 2, 4-8, and 10 must also be allowable.

Conclusion

In light of the Amendments and Remarks, Applicants respectfully request early and favorable action with regard to the present application, and a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344



Juan-Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

January 22, 2008
SPF/JCM/YOM